



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON PLATO'S *CRATYLUS* 389 D.

εἰ δὲ μὴ εἰς τὰς αὐτὰς συλλαβὰς ἕκαστος ὁ νομοθέτης τίθησιν, οὐδὲν δέ τοῦτο ἀ<μφι>γνοεῖν. So the Oxford text reads accepting Peiper's emendation, ἀμφιγνοεῖν, which I presume was suggested by such passages as *Polit.* 278 A; 291 B; *Sophist* 228 E. I think the manuscript reading ἀγνοεῖν can be defended, though not by Stallbaum's method of referring τοῦτο to the explanation that follows. What seems to have been overlooked is that οὐδέν is almost idiomatic with ἀγνοεῖν while I do not find it with ἀμφιγνοεῖν. The simple ἀγνοεῖν may take the meaning "find difficult" or "fail to recognize," "deem strange." See Jebb on Sophocles' *Electra* 1475, τὴν ἀγνοεῖς; "is the face so strange?"

In Euripides' *Andro.* 899 μηδὲν ἀγνοεῖ is not quite "learn all," as Liddell and Scott render. Way's "doubt not" is better. Orestes cannot believe his eyes that he sees Hermione, and Hermione assures him that it is really she. The frequent and idiomatic combination, then, virtually means "not to be put out, baffled, or disconcerted, or to have doubts, to apprehend fully." Thus Isocrates who uses it several times says of the apparent attack on Sparta in his ambiguous Panathenaicus that the more intelligent Spartans will not be misled; they will understand the matter perfectly, οὐδὲν ἀγνοήσῃν τῶν λεγομένων (251). And in the formula addressed to the jury at the close of Isaeus 7 and 8, and of Demosthenes 20, 36, 38, and 54, οἶμαι γὰρ ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ἀγνοεῖν, it practically means, "I think that I have made the whole case clear to you."

The thought of the Platonic passage, then, would be that the fact that the same semantic suggestion is sometimes embodied in different sounds or syllables ought not to put out or disconcert the student of language, or make him fail to understand the principle. This meaning could be brought out more clearly by inserting διὰ after δέ. The dropping of διὰ after a short word beginning with delta is, I believe, a not infrequent corruption. I tried to point out one of these cases in *Classical Philology*, IX, 191. There are others.

PAUL SHOREY

NOTE ON *LAUDICENI*. (PLIN. *EPIST.* ii. 14, 5)

Pliny the Younger, writing to his friend Maximus regarding the degeneracy of legal eloquence, complains bitterly of the practice of the lawyers of his day, who paid money to a *claque* that they might thus secure for their speeches the applause which they could not win by legitimate means. Speaking of these mercenary auditors, he continues: *Inde iam non inurbane Σοφοκλείς vocantur* [ἀπὸ τοῦ σοφῶς καὶ καλεῖσθαι]: *isdem Latinum nomen inpositum est Laudiceni*.¹

¹ Plin. *Epist.* ii. 14, 5. Keil's text.

The word *Laudiceni* is described in the lexicon of Forcellini, *s.v. Laudicenus*, as, "*Vox ioculariter ficta, de eo, qui laudat, ut ad cenam invitetur—*Plin. 2, *Ep.* 14 (quoted, as above). *Hic* Plin. ait Σοφοκλῆς *eos esse per iocum appellatos, qui indisertis oratoribus, spe captandae cenae, acclamabant, etc.*" This interpretation has been adopted with little or no hesitation by all the editors whose works I have been able to consult. It seems to have presented no difficulty to Merrill, for in his commentary he says,¹ "*Laudiceni*: of course from *laus* and *cena*; the pun on the name of the Laodiceans (*Lao-* or *Laudiceni*) is evident, the attempt being to cap the pun on a proper name in Greek by a similar pun in Latin: cf. Martial vi. 48. *Quod tam grande 'sophos' clamat tibi turba togata | Non tu, Pomponi, cena diserta tua est;* Anth. Pal. xi. 394. ποιητῆς πανάριστος ἀληθῶς ἐστὶν ἐκείνος | ὅστις δειπνίζει τοὺς ἀκροασαμένους." Westcott seems a bit less confident. His comment is,² "*Laudiceni*: (*laus, cena*) *who praise for a dinner. . . .* This may be an attempt at a pun, on *Laodiceni*, '*Laodiceans*,' for which *Laudiceni* is occasionally found. But it seems sorry wit."

My objections to the interpretations here given are: (1) that *Laudiceni*, if it is compounded from *laus* and *cena*, cannot mean "*those who praise for a dinner*," but only "*those who praise a dinner*," and that there is no possibility of bringing this second translation into harmony with the rest of the passage; (2) that such a compound as *Laudiceni*, from *laus* and *cena*, is almost impossible for Latin.³ The passages cited by Merrill, it will be noted, support no such form. Nor will the explanations, "*Volkwitz*," or "*popular etymology*," multitudinous as are the sins they may cover, hide the irregularities involved in such an interpretation as this, for the popular mind cannot be supposed to act in contravention of all rule and precedent, and it is just this which the current interpretation implies.

The following explanation seems to me far more satisfactory. Among the Romans, *Laodiceni* must commonly have been pronounced *Laudiceni*, as it was not infrequently spelled,⁴ and the common people, with their fondness for etymologizing, understood this word—perhaps seriously, perhaps humorously—as a compound of *laus* and *dico*, **Laudi-dic-eni* (the suffix, with geographical significance, would present no difficulty), reduced by haplogy⁵ to *Laudiceni*, as **stīpi-pendium* to *stipendium*, **semimestris* to

¹ *Selected Letters of the Younger Pliny* (London, 1903), p. 245.

² *Selected Letters of Pliny* (Boston, 1898), p. 161.

³ Brugmann, *Grundriss* II², Part 1, p. 64, cites but one example of this type of compound in Latin, viz., *exercipes*. Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 361, cites *vincipes*, coined by Tertullian by false analogy of *nudipes*; and *Verticordia*, an epithet of Venus. But the remarkable degree to which such compounds are absent from Latin is but emphasized by these far-sought examples.

⁴ *CIL*, X, 867; Orelli, 3520; cf. *CIL*, V, 4056; X, 770, Wilmanns, 915.

⁵ See Oertel, *Lectures on the Study of Language* (New York, 1902), p. 208, and the authorities there cited.

semestris, **nutri-trix* to *nutrix*, etc. This type of compound is abundantly exemplified in Latin in such words as *maledicus*, *veridicus*, *causidicus*, etc., and is especially frequent in the *sermo plebeius*;¹ and although neither **laudidicus* nor **laudicus* is to be found, the use of the expression "*laudes dicere*"² would seem to indicate that a compound of these two words, if properly formed, would not have seemed too foreign for Latin ears. It appears to have been a bit of popular humor to attach to those who sold their applause, and, perhaps, to any who were lavish in the bestowal of their praise, the appellation of "Laodiceans," that is (in the popular mind) "praise speakers."

The advantages of this interpretation are quite obvious. In the first place, it rids the passage of the *cena*, which has caused, at least, mental uneasiness; in the second place, it supplies what may fairly be called an equivalent for *Σοφοκλῆς*, which the context certainly leads us to expect;³ and lastly, the most important advantage is that it substitutes a possible Latin compound for one that is impossible.

JAMES E. DUNLAP

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

ON THE STELE OF THE FORUM

Some aid in dating the stele inscription, probably our earliest specimen of Latin, comes from an unexpected source. Last year while at Rome I had the good fortune to meet Commendatore Verri who has labored incessantly for a score of years upon the intricate problems of Latian geology and is now the acknowledged authority in that field. With a generosity of information and time that seems to be unlimited he explained the intricacies of the Latian rock strata and showed how, with microscopic slides and chemical means, it was possible to classify the Roman building tufas and identify them with respect to their several native quarries. He was called away from Rome before it occurred to me to question him regarding the stele, and naturally I could not remove a fragment from the sacred stone for examination. But on the criteria which he provided I feel safe to say that the stone is without question the kind that is found north of the Cremera and only there, a stone that had its origin in the volcanic ejecta of the Sabatini craters, not of the Alban volcanoes. What this means I have tried to explain in discussing the sources of the Servian wall in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, XXII, 181 ff.

¹ Cf. Cooper, *Word Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius* (New York, 1895), pp. 306 ff.

² Virgil *Ecl.* vi. 6; Ovid *Pont.* iv. 13, 23.

³ The editor of the Forcellini lexicon must have recognized this implication of the context, for, as may be seen in the article quoted above, he has transferred his definition of *Laudicenus* to *Σοφοκλῆς*.